

7

Remarks

The Applicants provisionally elect claims 11-21 for examination with traverse.

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement. According to MPEP 803, "Under the statute an application may properly be required to be restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions only if they are able to support separate patents and they are either independent . . . or distinct. *If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.*" (emphasis added)

The subject matter of claims 1-10 was classified into class 400, subclass 88. The subject matter of claims 11-21 was classified into class 400, subclass 76. The Applicants respectfully contend that because of the close relationship of the subject matter in these two subclasses of class 400 and related limitations in the claimed subject matter of claim 1 and claim 11, it is possible to make a search and examination of the entire application without serious burden upon the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this restriction requirement.

Respectfully submitted,

James P. Slupe, et al.

By 

Gregg W. Wisdom

Reg. No. 40,231

September 15, 2004

(360) 212-8052

S/N: 09/692,844
Case: 10004382-1